



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*On*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,903	06/29/2001	Hong Bae Park	041501-5437	4657

9629 7590 12/31/2003

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER
----------

SANTIAGO, MARICELI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/894,903

Applicant(s)

PARK, HONG BAE

Examiner

Mariceli Santiago

Art Unit

2879

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached Office Action.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed November 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues (Pages 2 and 3, lines 15-23 and 1-15, respectively) that the prior art reference, Lynn et al. (WO 92/02947), fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "first and second frames sealing the first and second substrates" as set forth in claim 1, since the elements **155 and 156** disclosed by Lynn, and relied upon by the Examiner to suggest the claimed frames, are electrode substrates and not the frames as claimed by applicant. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Lynn discloses a flat fluorescent lamp comprising top and bottom substrates **132 and 134**, the assembly further comprising electrode substrates **155 and 156** that support the electrodes **154** inside the discharge spaces at opposite ends of the substrates cavities. The electrode substrates **155 and 156** provide support to electrodes **154** while providing a sealing frame structure (frame being defined as an open structure or rim for encasing, holding, or bordering<sup>1</sup>) between the top and bottom substrates.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above the rejection of claim 1 is deemed proper.

In regards to claims 2-16, claims 2-16 are dependent on claim 1, therefore the same arguments for the rejection of claim 1 applies to dependent claims 2-16.

### *Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mariceli Santiago whose telephone number is (703) 305-1083. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com>, frame n.

Application/Control Number: 09/894,903

Page 3

Art Unit: 2879

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel, can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

*msz 12/28/03*  
Mariceli Santiago  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879

*NKP.*  
NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800